III. REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of December 14, 2009, with their representative, Hunter E. Webb. A previously filed amendment was submitted in advance of the interview. In the interview, Applicants' representative discussed features of the claimed invention that Applicants asserts are not disclosed by Bohnke, including, but not limited to the decoding in a single iteration through the set of frames of the claimed invention. The Examiner agreed with Applicants that this feature is not taught by Bohnke.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office has asserted that claims 1-21 fail to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office argues that the limitation "decoding in a single iteration through a set of frames" is not sufficiently described in the specification. Applicants respectfully direct the Office to paragraphs 0033-0038 of the original specification, which describe normal playback mode and operations deviating from normal playback mode that are performed by the

invention to provide enhanced trick mode playback. In para. 0033 and accompanying Fig. 5, the specification recites that "...the pointers change with successive frames to prevent a frame from being decoded to a particular buffer and overwriting a previously decoded from that has yet to be read out (e.g., displayed)." To this extent, the specification first establishes that in normal mode playback frames are read out for decoding in succession, i.e., one at a time. Turning now to para. 0037, specification describes the enhanced trick mode play of the claimed invention, stating that "...unlike during normal playback mode, current pointer 154 and past pointer 156 are "locked" to particular buffers. To this extent, while the enhanced trick mode play still decodes in succession, progressing through the set of frames frame by frame, it writes the frames to different buffers than in normal playback mode. As such, the progression through the set of frames for decoding purposes is still performed in sequence, i.e., in a single pass through the set of frames.

Continuing to the first sentence of para. 0038, the specification states:

As the frames are decoded, they will be read out in order from their corresponding buffers according to display synchronization signal 162. So that the proper display order is maintained, the controller microcode will also synchronize the display pointer (not shown) to the current pointer address."

To this extent, the reading out for display does not require a pass through the set of frames that is in addition to the decoding pass, but rather, the reading out for display is performed "As the frames are decoded." As such, the combination of the description of the frame by frame decoding of paras. 0034 and 0037 and the reading out for display as the frames are being decoded would make it clear to one skilled in the art, *inter alia*, that the frames that are decoded by the alternating decoding performed in a single iteration through the set of frames of the claimed invention are in condition for, and are displayed during that single iteration. Thus, no further

decoding iterations through the set of frames are necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: __April 22, 2010__

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)